



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,040	07/25/2001	Gabriel Beged-Dov	10007847-1	7405

7590 11/10/2003
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

HAMILTON, MONPLAISIR G

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2172

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/916,040

Applicant(s)

BEGED-DOV ET AL.

Examiner

Monplaisir G Hamilton

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 21 and 22 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2172

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 7/25/01 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4, 9-12 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,584,480 issued to Ferrel et al, herein referred to as Ferrel.

Referring to Claims 1, 9 and 17:

Ferrel discloses a method for parsing a markup file, comprising: parsing a first portion of the markup file with a lightweight parser in a computer system, the lightweight parser being capable of performing a first set of parsing tasks (col 30, lines 9-15); parsing a second portion of the markup file with a heavyweight parser in the computer system (col 30, lines 11-16), the heavyweight parser being capable of performing a second set of parsing tasks, wherein the first set of parsing tasks is a subset of the second set of parsing tasks (col 29, lines 60-65); and transitioning between the parsing of the first portion of the markup file with the lightweight parser to the parsing of the second portion of the markup file with the heavyweight parser upon an occurrence of a transition event (col 30, line 10-col 31, line 45).

Art Unit: 2172

Referring to Claims 2, 10 and 18:

Ferrel discloses the limitations as discussed in Claims 1, 9 and 17 above. Ferrel further discloses detecting an occurrence of the transition event comprising a requirement that the lightweight parser perform a parsing task excluded from the first set of parsing tasks (col 30, lines 10-15).

Referring to Claims 3, 11 and 19:

Ferrel discloses the limitations as discussed in Claims 1, 9 and 17 above. Ferrel further discloses, wherein the step of parsing a first portion of the markup file with a lightweight parser further comprises establishing a channel applying the first portion of the markup file to the lightweight parser and directing a number of events generated by the lightweight parser to an application (col 30, lines 9-14).

Referring to Claims 4, 12 and 20:

Ferrel discloses the limitations as discussed in Claims 1, 9 and 17 above. Ferrel further discloses, wherein the step of parsing a second portion of the markup file with a heavyweight parser further comprises establishing a channel to apply the second portion of the markup file to the heavyweight parser and to direct events generated by the heavyweight parser to an application (col 31, lines 30-40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5-8 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over US 6,584,480 issued to Ferrel et al, herein referred to as Ferrel further in view of US/2002/0073399 issued to Golden herein referred to as Golden.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or

Art Unit: 2172

subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Referring to Claims 5 and 13:

Ferrel discloses the limitations of Claim 1 and 9 above.

Ferrel does not explicitly disclose “maintaining an events stack in the computer system, the events stack having a number of open events from the lightweight parser.”

Golden discloses maintaining an events stack in the computer system, the events stack having a number of open events from the lightweight parser (paragraph 0031, lines 15-23; paragraph 0135, lines 1-5; paragraph 0214-0237).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Ferrel to maintain an event stack for the open events from the lightweight parser. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would allow the events to be returned to the high-level parser (Ferrel: col 30, lines 20-25)

Referring to Claims 6 and 14:

Ferrel in view of Golden discloses the limitations as discussed in Claims 5 and 13 above.

Golden further discloses maintaining an events stack in the computer system, further comprising: storing a number of open events from the lightweight parser in the events stack; matching a closing event with one of the opening events in the events stack; and deleting the opening event matching the closing event from the event stack (paragraph 0230-0231).

Art Unit: 2172

Referring to Claims 7 and 15:

Ferrel in view of Golden discloses the limitations as discussed in Claims 5 and 13 above. Golden further discloses wherein the step of transitioning between the parsing of the first portion of the markup file with the lightweight parser to the parsing of the second portion of the markup file with the heavyweight parser further comprises: generating a priming file from the events stored in the events stack; and applying the priming file to the heavyweight parser (paragraph 0034, lines 1-13; paragraph 0391, lines 1-5; 0392, lines 1-26).

Referring to Claims 8 and 16:

Ferrel in view of Golden discloses the limitations as discussed in Claims 7 and 15 above. Golden further discloses wherein the step of transitioning between the parsing of the first portion of the markup file with the lightweight parser to the parsing of the second portion of the markup file with the heavyweight parser further comprises discarding a number of priming events generated by the heavyweight parser upon the application of the priming file thereto (paragraph 0034, lines 1-13; paragraph 0391, lines 1-5; 0392, lines 1-26).

Referring to Claims 21 and 22:

Ferrel discloses a method for parsing a markup file, comprising: parsing the markup file with a lightweight parser in a computer system, the lightweight parser being capable of performing a first set of parsing tasks (col 30, lines 5-11); detecting an occurrence of a transition event in the computer system, the transition event comprising a requirement that the lightweight parser perform a parsing task excluded from the first set of parsing tasks (col 30, lines 10-15);

Art Unit: 2172

and transitioning from the parsing of the markup file with the lightweight parser to parsing the markup file with the heavyweight parser in the computer system upon an occurrence of the transition event by (col 30, lines 15-25): ceasing an application of the markup file to the lightweight parser (col 30, lines 20-30; col 31, lines 30-35); and parsing a remaining portion of the markup file with the heavyweight parser after the application of the priming file, the heavyweight parser being capable of performing a second set of parsing tasks, wherein the first set of parsing tasks is a subset of the second set of parsing tasks (col 31, lines 30-45).

Ferrel does not explicitly disclose “maintaining an events stack in the computer system by storing a number of open events generated by the lightweight parser in the events stack and deleting select ones of the open events previously stored in the events stack that match corresponding ones of a number of closing events generated by the lightweight parser;

generating a priming file from the current ones of the events stored in the events stack and applying the priming file to the heavyweight parser; and discarding a number of priming events generated by the heavyweight parser upon the application of the priming file thereto;”

Golden discloses maintaining an events stack in the computer system by storing a number of open events generated by the lightweight parser in the events stack and deleting select ones of the open events previously stored in the events stack that match corresponding ones of a number of closing events generated by the lightweight parser (paragraph 0218-0234);

generating a priming file from the current ones of the events stored in the events stack and applying the priming file to the heavyweight parser; and discarding a number of priming events generated by the heavyweight parser upon the application of the priming file thereto (paragraph 0034, lines 1-13; paragraph 0391, lines 1-5; 0392, lines 1-26).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Ferrel such that an events stack is maintained by the computer system and a priming file is used to bring the heavyweight parser/engine in sync with the processing of the file. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because it would allow the events to be returned to the high-level parser (Ferrel: col 30, lines 20-25).

Prior Art

5. US 20030037069 issued to Davison, Jeff. Davidson discloses a system and method for processing a markup language file having one or more portions. Specifically, the system downloads a first markup language file using the hyper text transfer protocol and references the first markup language file by its uniform resource location or by a name of a local file on a system on which a user is operating. The first markup language is parsed for one or more portions of the first markup language file. Each portion of the first markup language file is stored into a directory structure containing folders, subfolders, and files complying with the structure of the first markup language file.

US 20020038320 issued to Brook, John Charles. Brook discloses a method of parsing a markup language document comprising syntactic elements is disclosed, said method comprising, for one of said syntactic elements, the steps of identifying (310) a type of the element, processing (318) the element by determining a hash representation thereof if said type

Art Unit: 2172

is a first type, and augmenting (314) an at least partial structural representation of the document using the hash representation if said type is said first type.

US 6631379 issued to Cox, David A. Cox discloses an XML Data Loader which employs the SAX parsing technology, provides an extendible architecture to generate SQL for each type of XML document to be loaded, and leverages multithreading and decoupling of processes to parse an XML file and to update a database. By using object-oriented programming methodologies, the system and method create new instances of the XML data loader for each XML file to be loaded into a database. Thus, many XML data files may be processed and loaded simultaneously, which minimizes system memory requirements, improves system reliability and memory management, and reduces processing time required from the start of processing an XML file to completing its loading into a database. The invention is applicable to other types of markup language documents, as well.

Art Unit: 2172


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monplaisir G Hamilton whose telephone number is 1703-305-5116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on 1703-305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 1703-305-3900.

Monplaisir Hamilton


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER